

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Independent claims 1 and 10 have been amended include the elements of dependent claims 4 and 16 and claims 12 and 18, respectively, and claims 2, 3, 5, 13, 17 and 19 have been editorially amended. Claims 4, 12, 16 and 18 have been canceled. Claims 1-3, 5-11, 13-15, 17 and 19 are now pending in the application. The rejections are respectfully submitted to be obviated in view of the amendments and remarks presented herein.

As a preliminary matter, the Examiner has not acknowledged on the PTOL-326 form that all certified copies of the priority documents have been received, as box 1 has not been checked. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to acknowledge receipt of all certified copies of the priority documents in the next Office communication.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 5, 7, 10, 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being anticipated by Margulis in view of Mizuno et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0046696; hereinafter "Mizuno"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, as amended, is patentable because Margulis in view of Mizuno fails to disclose each and every element of the claim. For example, Margulis and Mizuno, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest a wireless processing module, which processes one of the first TS and the second TS as a processed output and wirelessly transmits the processed output, in combination with other elements of the claim.

In the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that the transmitter (524) and communications processor (636) in FIGS. 5 and 6 correspond to the claimed wireless processing module, and refers to paragraphs [0069] and [0070] of Margulis. Applicant respectfully disagrees because Margulis's transmitter (524) and communications processor (636) both processes a *combined* processed audio, video, and data transport stream (paragraphs [0015], [0062], [0063] and [0069]). As such, Margulis does not teach or suggest "a wireless processing module, which processes one of the first TS and the second TS as a processed output and wirelessly transmits the processed output," as recited by claim 1 (emphasis added). Mizuno clearly does not remedy the deficiencies of Margulis.

Furthermore, the Examiner concedes in paragraph 6 on page 14 of the Office Action that Margulis and Mizuno do not explicitly teach one switching unit operable to receive the two inputs and selects one of the two inputs to output to the encoding unit, and has relied upon Forler (U.S. Patent No. 7,222,353) in column 4, line 54 to column 5, line 7 for the alleged teaching of "one switching unit operable to receive two inputs and selects one of the two inputs to output to an encoding unit" (paragraph 6 on page 14 of the Office Action).

In Forler, a television receiver system is disclosed as shown in FIG. 1, and includes a video switch (140) between a baseband composite video signal (tuned channel video from tuner (105) and IF processor (130)), and a video input at signal input (102). The selected video signal is output as VIDEO1 from the video switch (140) to a video signal processor (155) (column 4, line 54 to column 5, line 7). As such, Forler's video switch (140) is a simple switch which outputs one of two input signals, based on a user selection.

The combination of Margulis in view of Mizuno and further in view of Forler still does not teach or suggest the claimed invention, in which "the TS converting unit further comprises

one switching unit operable to receive the external SD image signal *and the SD image signal output from the converter* and *selects one* of the external SD image signal and the SD image signal output from the converter to output to the encoding unit,” as recited by amended claim 1 (emphasis added). In Margulis, the subsystem processor (518) receives the digital video from digitizer (516), the digital audio from the ADC (530), and the digital A/V on path (536) and *combines all of these received signals* to form one transport stream (paragraphs [0015], [0062], [0063] and [0069]). Furthermore, Margulis generally states that the subsystem processor (518) “may receive high-definition television (HDTV) video programming and responsively generate a standard definition television stream” (paragraph [0062]).

Even if the video switch (140) of Forler was implemented in the system of Margulis in view of Mizuno having a subsystem processor (518), such a system still would not teach or suggest the explicitly recited switching unit operable to received the external SD image signal *and the SD image signal* output from the converter and *selects one of the external SD image signal and the SD image signal* output from the converter to output to the encoding unit, as recited by amended claim 1. Even though Forler discloses the switching of video signals to output a selected video signal based on a user selection, and Margulis teaches the possible reception of digital video signals as well as high-definition video, there is no teaching or suggestion in Margulis in view of Mizuno and further in view of Forler of receiving by a switching unit, the external SD image signal and the SD image signal output from the converter and further selecting one of these two specifically recited signals, as recited by amended claim 1. Switching is not taught or suggested to be specifically between the external SD image signal and the SD image signal output from the converter, in the system of Margulis in view of Mizuno and further in view of Forler.

For at least the above reasons, claim 1, as amended, is patentable.

For reasons similar to those submitted for claim 1, claim 10 is patentable. Although the Examiner relies upon Margulis's subsystem processor (518), input analog video (514), and input digital A/V (536) as shown in FIG. 5 and described in paragraphs [0058], [0059], [0062] and [0063] for the alleged teaching of "one switching between one of the internal SD image signal and the external SD image signal, and wherein the converting one of the internal SD image signal and the external SD image signal into the second TS comprises converting one of the internal SD image signal and the external SD image signal received from the one switching, into the second TS," Margulis's subsystem processor (518) receives the digital video from digitizer (516), the digital audio from the ADC (530), and the digital A/V on path (536) and combines all of these received signals to form one transport stream (paragraphs [0015], [0062], [0063] and [0069]).

As such, Margulis fails to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, "one switching between one of the internal SD image signal and the external SD image signal; ... encoding one of the external SD image signal and the internal SD image signal into the second TS; and converting one of the internal SD image signal and the external SD image signal received from the one switching, into the second TS," as recited by amended claim 10. Claims 5, 7, 13 and 15, which depend from claim 1 or 10, are patentable for at least the reasons submitted for their respective base claims as well as for their additionally recited elements.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 11, 14 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Margulis in view of Mizuno and further in view of Levandowski. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 11, 14 and 19, which depend from claim 1 or 10, are patentable for at least the reasons submitted for the respective base claims and because Levandowski fails to make up for the deficiencies of Margulis in view of Mizuno. In Levandowski, although the triple decoder and CPU (216) as shown in FIG. 2 receives an SD transport stream, an HD/SD transport stream, and an ATSC transport stream, all of these streams are processed concurrently by the triple decoder and CPU (216) into respective MPEG or ATSC bit-streams (column 3, lines 10-29). One of the three bit-streams is decoded internally by the triple decoder and CPU (216) to provide a standard-definition television signal, NTSC video and a corresponding audio signal (column 3, lines 29-32). Another of the three transport streams is provided to an external high-definition/standard-definition (HD/SD) television signal decoder (220) (column 3, lines 33-35).

As is clearly described and shown by Levandowski, the triple decoder and CPU (216) processes all of the input transport streams and ***outputs all of the streams after processing.*** Therefore, Levandowski does not teach or suggest any switching or selection occurring in the triple decoder and CPU (216), nor does Levandowski teach or suggest a switching or selection between an internal SD image signal and an external or input SD image signal. Thus, because amended claims 1 and 10 are both patentable over the combination of Margulis, Mizuno and Levandowski, claims 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 11, 14 and 19, which depend from claim 1 or 10, are also patentable for at least the reasons submitted for their respective base claims as well as for their additionally recited elements.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are respectfully requested.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Margulis in view of Mizuno and further in view of Forler (U.S. Patent No. 7,222,353).

As claim 1 has been amended to include the elements of claim 16 which has subsequently been canceled, the claimed invention is distinguished over the cited references for at least the reasons discussed above relating to amended claim 1.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are respectfully requested.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Margulis in view of Mizuno in view of Forler and further in view of Levandowski. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, claim 1 is patentable over Margulis in view of Mizuno in view of Forler. Levandowski fails to make up for the deficiencies of Margulis in view of Mizuno in view of Forler. As also discussed above, Levandowski does not teach or suggest any switching or selection occurring in the triple decoder and CPU (216), nor does Levandowski teach or suggest a switching or selection between an internal SD image signal and an external or input SD image signal. Thus, because amended claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Margulis, Mizuno, Forler and Levandowski, claim 17, which depends from claim 1, is also patentable for at least the reasons submitted for its base claim as well as for their additionally recited elements.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are respectfully requested.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Lenny R. Jiang
Registration No. 52,432

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: August 1, 2008